IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA Alexandria Division

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

Plaintiff,

CR. NO.16-cr-162

VS.

YUSUF ABDIRIZAK WEHELIE,

Defendant.

MOTIONS HEARING

July 13, 2016

- - -

BEFORE: THE HONORABLE IVAN D. DAVIS

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE GOVERNMENT: OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

BY: BRANDON L. VAN GRACK, ESQ.

FOR THE DEFENDANT: OFFICE OF THE FEDERAL PUBLIC DEFENDER

BY: CADENCE MERTZ, ESQ.

- - -

OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER: RENECIA A. WILSON, RMR, CRR

U.S. District Court 401 Courthouse Square Alexandria, VA 22314

(703)501-1580

INDEX

WITNESS	DIRECT	CROSS	REDIRECT
R. Gaylord	4	17	32
CLOSING BY GOVERNMENT		35	
CLOSING BY DEFENSE		38	
COURT'S RULING		41	

```
(Thereupon, the following was heard in open
1
    court at 2:36 p.m.)
2
                THE CLERK: United States of America versus
3
    Yusuf Abdirizak Wehelie. Case 16-MG-302.
 4
                MR. VAN GRACK: Good afternoon, Your Honor,
5
    Brandon Van Grack and John Gibbs on behalf of the United
 6
    States.
7
                THE COURT: Good afternoon.
8
                MS. MERTZ: Good afternoon, Your Honor.
9
    Cadence Mertz or behalf of Mr. Wehelie.
10
                THE COURT:
                           Good afternoon.
11
                The matter before is the Court on a joint
12
    preliminary detention hearing. Are the parties ready to
13
    proceed?
14
                MS. MERTZ: Yes, Your Honor.
15
                MR. VAN GRACK: Yes, Your Honor.
16
    indictment was obtained earlier today and so I believe
17
    the only matter before the Court is a detention hearing,
18
    and the government is, in fact, seeking detention.
19
                MS. MERTZ: Your Honor, for the record we've
20
    not been informed of that indictment and I have not seen
21
    it.
22
                THE COURT: Both parties received a copy of
23
    the Pretrial Services report in this matter?
24
                MR. VAN GRACK: Yes, we have, Your Honor.
2.5
```

```
MS. MERTZ:
                            Yes, Your Honor.
1
                 THE COURT:
                             Does either party dispute the
2
    accuracy of the information that's contained in that
3
    report?
 4
                 MS. MERTZ:
                            No. Your Honor.
 5
                 MR. VAN GRACK:
                                 We do not, Your Honor.
 6
                 THE COURT:
                             The Court will adopt as factually
7
    accurate the information contained in the Pretrial
8
    Services report.
                 Is the government relying on the Pretrial
10
    Services report or you would like to call a witness or
11
    introduce any further information?
12
                 MR. VAN GRACK: Yes, Your Honor, we're
13
    relying on the report. In addition we will be calling a
14
    witness.
15
                 THE COURT: You may proceed.
16
                 MR. VAN GRACK: At this time the government
17
    will call Special Agent Richard Gaylord.
18
                 THEREUPON, RICHARD GAYLORD, having been duly
19
    sworn, testified as follows:
20
                 THE WITNESS:
                               I do.
21
                 THE CLERK: You may be seated.
22
                     DIRECT EXAMINATION
23
    BY MR. VAN GRACK:
24
           Would you please state your name and spell your
2.5
       Q.
```

```
last name for the record.
1
            My name is Richard Gaylord, G-A-Y-L-O-R-D.
 2
            And where are you currently employed?
 3
       Q.
            I'm employed at the FBI Washington Field Office.
       Α.
 4
            And what is your current title?
 5
       Ο.
            I'm a special agent.
       Α.
 6
            And how long have you been a special agent?
 7
       Q.
            For 12 years.
 8
       Α.
            And, which squad do you serve in at the Washington
 9
       Q.
    Field Office?
10
            I currently serve on CT 5.
11
       Α.
            And what does CT stand for?
12
       Q.
            CT stands for counterterrorism.
13
       Α.
            And how long have you served in the
14
       Ο.
    counterterrorism squad?
15
            I've been on that squad for two years.
16
            And can you briefly describe your duties with the
17
    counterterrorism squad.
18
                 MS. MERTZ: Your Honor, we would stipulate to
19
    his expertise.
20
                 THE COURT: So stipulated.
21
    BY MR. VAN GRACK:
22
            Special Agent Gaylord, are you familiar with the
23
    facts of this case?
24
            I am.
2.5
       Α.
```

- \circ . What is the basis for your familiarity?
- A. I'm the case agent for the investigation. I have spoken to other agents who have worked on the investigation. I have spoken to undercover law enforcement officers who have participated in the investigation. I've reviewed the evidence, and I've listened to recordings made during the investigations.
- Q. Special Agent Gaylord, if you wouldn't mind speaking up.
 - A. Yes, sir.
 - Q. Thank you.

Do you see the defendant in court today?

13 A. I do.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Can you please describe what he is wearing and what he is sitting -- and where he is sitting?
- A. He's sitting at the table to my left in a green jumpsuit.

MR. VAN GRACK: May the record reflect that the witness has identified the defendant.

THE COURT: The record will so reflect.

BY MR. VAN GRACK:

- Q. As part of your investigation, did you prepare an affidavit in support of the criminal complaint in this case?
- 25 A. I did.

At this time, I'm showing you what has been marked 1 as Government's Exhibit 1. Do you recognize that 2 document? 3 I do. Α. 4 And what is that document? Ο. That is the affidavit in support of a criminal 6 complaint and arrest warrant. 7 I'd ask you to turn to page six of Government's 8 Exhibit 1. Is there a signature on that page? 9 Yes, there is. Α. 10 Is that your signature? 11 Ο. It is. Α. 12 Is the information contained in Government's 13 Exhibit 1 a true and accurate reflection of the facts as 14 you know them when the affidavit was executed? 15 It is. Α. 16 At this time, Your Honor, the government would 17 move Government's Exhibit 1 into evidence. 18 MS. MERTZ: No objection, Your Honor. 19 THE COURT: So admitted. 20 BY MR. VAN GRACK: 21 Are you aware of the citizenship for the 22 defendant? 23 I am. 24 Α. And what is his citizenship? 2.5 Q.

He is a United States citizen. 1 Α. And where was he born? 2 Q. He was born in the United States, Virginia. 3 Α. And his age? Ο. 4 He's 25. Α. 5 At any attempt -- at any point in your 6 investigation, did the defendant attempt to obtain a 7 firearm? 8 He did. Α. When? Q. 10 In January of this year. 11 Α. And who did he attempt to acquire the firearm 12 Q. from? 1.3 In conversations with one of our undercover law Α. 14 enforcement officers, he requested assistance in 15 obtaining a firearm. 16 And can you describe what occurred in that 17 attempt? 18 In that attempt, he asked our undercover law 19 enforcement officer if he would help Mr. Wehelie in 20 getting a firearm for himself and his cousin. 21 And, did the defendant indicate why he wanted his 22 cousin to obtain a firearm? 23

24

```
And did the defendant indicate in that
1
    communication with the undercover law enforcement officer
 2
    that, in fact, that weapon would be for both him and his
 3
    cousin?
 4
                 MS. MERTZ: Your Honor, objection, leading.
 5
                 MR. VAN GRACK: Your Honor, I'll rephrase.
 6
    BY MR. VAN GRACK:
 7
            Special Agent Gaylord, was this conversation
 8
    between the defendant and the undercover law enforcement
 9
    officer recorded?
10
            It was.
11
       Α.
            Have you listened to that recording?
12
       Q.
            I have.
13
       Α.
            What statements did the defendant make about that
       Ο.
14
    gun?
15
           The defendant said it would definitely be for both
       Α.
16
    of us.
17
            Did, in fact, the undercover law enforcement
18
       Ο.
    officer obtain a weapon for the cousin?
19
            He did --
       Α.
2.0
                 MS. MERTZ: Your Honor, again, objection,
21
    leading.
22
                 THE COURT: Overruled.
23
                 THE WITNESS: He did not.
24
    BY MR. VAN GRACK:
2.5
```

At any point in your investigation, did you learn 1 whether the defendant in fact fired a weapon? 2 I did. Α. 3 Can you describe the circumstances under which you 4 learned that? 5 Objection, Your Honor, relevance. MS. MERTZ: 6 MR. VAN GRACK: Your Honor, there's --7 THE COURT: Detention hearing. He fired a 8 That could be -- Court could reasonably infer he weapon. 9 could be dangerous. 10 Overruled. 11 THE WITNESS: The defendant said he had fired 12 an AK-47 while he was in Yemen. 1.3 BY MR. VAN GRACK: 14 At any point in your investigation did you learn 15 whether the defendant, in fact, possessed a firearm? 16 He did. Α. 17 And, can you describe how he became -- came into 18 possession of that firearm? 19 During a conversation with the undercover law Α. 2.0 enforcement officer, the defendant was asked if he would 21 transport the weapons on behalf of the undercover. 22 And when did that conversation occur? 23 Q. January of 2016. 24 Α.

And was this conversation recorded?

2.5

Q.

A. It was.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

- Q. Have you listened to that conversation?
- A. I have.
- Q. And what were the firearms that were involved in that offer?
 - A. The firearms were four Cobray Mac-11 machine guns.
- \circ . And, what is the -- are you aware of the capabilities of the Mac-11?
- A. Yes, they're capable of firing up to 1200 rounds per minute.
- Q. And, does the Mac-11 go by another name or have some sort of slang term associated with it?
 - A. They're multiple. It is a machine gun.
- Q. And did, in fact, the defendant accept the undercover law enforcement officer to transport those firearms?
- A. He did.
- Q. And can you describe the circumstances under which he transported those firearms?
- A. In February of 2016, the defendant traveled to Baltimore, Maryland, and met with a second undercover law enforcement officer. At that time he was given the four Cobray Mac-11s, and then he placed them in a bag, concealed them with additional towels and purses to further hide what would be in the bag and then loaded

```
them into his vehicle and drove down to Fairfax County,
1
    Virginia.
 2
           And, was that interaction in the Baltimore hotel
       Ο.
 3
    room recorded?
 4
            It was.
       Α.
            Have you listened to that recording?
       Q.
 6
            I have.
 7
       Α.
            And what occurred after the defendant arrived in
 8
    Virginia?
 9
            He provided the weapons to another undercover law
10
    enforcement officer in the parking lot in Fairfax County,
11
    Virginia.
12
           And was that interaction recorded?
1.3
       Q.
            It was.
14
       Α.
           And have you listened to that recording?
15
       Ο.
            I have.
       Α.
16
           Was the defendant paid anything for this
17
    transaction?
18
            He was paid $300.
19
       Α.
           You mentioned multiple undercover law enforcement
20
       Q.
    officers. At what point did the defendant first interact
21
    with the law enforcement officers -- undercover law
22
    enforcement officer?
23
            He first met the undercover law enforcement
24
    officer in December of 2015.
2.5
```

- And this is the undercover officer who he attempted to obtain a gun for his cousin? Correct. Α. Did they engage in communications beyond December of 2010? They did. Α. And what were the topics of those conversations? Q. They discussed illegal activity as well as jihad. Α. And what -- were those conversations recorded? Q. They were. Α.
 - Q. Have you listened to those conversations?
- A. I have.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. What did the defendant say about jihad?
- A. The defendant said he loved jihad and had spoken about it with others.
- Q. Did at any point -- did defendant specifically talk to the undercover law enforcement officer about engaging in jihad?
- A. He did. He spoke to the undercover about potentially providing more materials to the quote, unquote brothers overseas and then the defendant asked the undercover if he would help him in traveling.
- Q. At any point in their conversation, was -- were terrorist groups discussed?
 - A. They were.

Q. Which groups were discussed?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

- A. ISIS, otherwise referred to as ISIL.
- Q. And what does ISIS stand for?
- A. ISIL stands for the Islamic state and the Levant.
- Q. And what did the defendant say about ISIL or ISIS?
- A. He -- when he first heard from the undercover that they were talking about ISIS, he became visibly excited and shed a tear.
 - Q. Did the defendant say anything else about ISIL?
- A. He was very supportive. He said he liked that they would kill hundreds of people and be proud of it.
- $\ \ \, \bigcirc$. Did the defendant indicate when he first developed his feelings for ISIL?
 - A. Yes, he said he started following ISIL in 2012.
- Q. And did the defendant discuss whether he associated people who are supporters of ISIL?
- ${\tt A.}$ He did. He had spoken with others who he said were down.
- Q. And, all of these conversations with respect to ISIL, were these conversations recorded?
 - A. They were.
 - Q. Have you listened to those recordings?
- A. I have.

A. He has.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. And what did the defendant say about violence in ISIL?
- A. In addition to being proud that they killed one hundred people, the defendant was watching a video with one of the undercovers. In the recording you could hear the undercover say that the person snapped his neck, and the defendant laughed and said, yes.
 - Q. And was this interaction recorded?
- A. It was.
 - Q. Have you listened to that recording?
- A. I have.
- Q. And the undercover law enforcement officer, is that the original law enforcement officer that you discussed from December, 2015?
- A. Correct.
 - Q. At any point did the defendant discuss providing support for ISIL?
 - A. Yes.
- A. The defendant asked the undercover if at some point when quote, unquote, the time is right, he would help him to travel.
 - Q. Did the defendant make any other comments about

traveling to ISIL?

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- A. He did. He had said that he would -- he desired to travel to Libya, first Tunisia and then ultimately Libya.
- Q. And did the defendant indicate why he wanted to travel to Libya and Tunisia to join ISIL?
- A. The defendant thought he would fit in more there in that the government, the U.S. Government would not be watching that area as closely as say the Middle East.
- ${\it Q}$. Why did the defendant believe or state that he believed he would be better able to fit in Libya and Tunisia?
 - A. He said it was because he was black.
- Q. At any point did the defendant indicate what would happen if he was unable to travel to Libya to join ISIL?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. And what did the defendant say he would do if he was unable to travel to Libya?
- A. In conversations with the undercover law enforcement there is a plan laid out of potentially traveling by boat and if not by boat, by plane. And then the defendant said if he could not leave, he would potentially conduct an attack here in the U.S.
- ${\tt Q}.$ Did the defendant discuss what kind of attack would occur in the United States?

```
He did.
 1
       Α.
            And what did the defendant say about that attack?
 2
       Q.
            He said he would attack a military recruiting
       Α.
 3
    station.
 4
            And did he discuss the specifics as to how he
       Ο.
 5
    would attack a military recruiting station?
 6
            He did.
                     He stated that he would first go in and
 7
       Α.
    pretend to enlist in the military so that they would
 8
    become more comfortable with them and then he would go
    back in and shoot up the place.
10
            Did the defendant indicate that there were other
11
    means in which he would kill members of the military at
12
    the recruiting station?
1.3
            He mentioned potentially getting explosives.
14
            Was that conversation that you just relayed
15
       0.
    recorded?
16
            It was.
       Α.
17
            Have you listened to that conversation?
18
       Ο.
            I have.
19
       Α.
                 MR. VAN GRACK: Your Honor, at this time, we
20
    have no more questions for Special Agent Gaylord.
21
                 THE COURT:
                            Cross-examination.
22
                 MS. MERTZ:
                              Thank you, Your Honor.
23
                          CROSS-EXAMINATION
24
    BY MS. MERTZ:
2.5
```

Agent Gaylord, you mentioned that the first 1 contact with your agent and Mr. Wehelie was in December 2 of 2015, correct? 3 Correct. Α. 4 How did that contact come about? 5 Ο. That had come about while Mr. Wehelie with 6 somebody else in the meeting and doing some potential 7 illegal activity. 8 What illegal activity? Q. Moving cigarettes from -- untaxed cigarettes from 10 Virginia to Maryland. 11 And the undercover agent was involved in the Q. 12 moving of cigarettes? 13 He was not involved in that, no. Α. 14 He met Mr. Wehelie during that incident? 15 Ο. Yes. 16 Α. And did he befriend Mr. Wehelie? 17 Ο. He did. 18 Α. He continued the contact with Mr. Wehelie? 19 Q. He did. 20 Α. He did that intentionally? 21 Q. He did. 22 Α. And, did he continue to call Mr. Wehelie on his 23 Q. phone? 24

He did.

Α.

- And he continued to text message with him? 1 Ο. Yes. 2 Α. And reach out to him maybe on Facebook? 3 Q. I'm not sure if it was on Facebook, but he did 4 continue to reach out. 5 About how often would you reach out to Mr. 6 Wehelie? 7 I cannot say. 8 Α. Were other agents reaching out to Mr. Wehelie as 9 Q. we11? 10 I don't believe so. 11 Α. And this contact went on for approximately two 12 Q. months, based on the timeline in your affidavit; is that 13 correct? 14 Correct. Α. 15 And after Mr. Wehelie delivered the guns from one Ο. 16 agent to another agent in February of 2016, did the FBI 17 arrest him? 18 They did not. 19 Α. And that was five months ago, correct? 20 Q. Correct. Α. 21 Did the agent make any attempt to ascertain Mr. 22 Wehelie's state of mind before he attempted to befriend 23
 - A. He did not.

2.5

him and contacted him on a regular basis?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2.5

right?

Did he make any attempt to determine whether or not Mr. Wehelie was suffering from any kind of mental illness at that time? He did not. Α. Whether or not he had any kind of substance abuse addictions? Α. He did not. He didn't make any attempt to determine whether or 0. not Mr. Wehelie was in a fragile state of mind? No. Α. Did he attempt to ascertain whether or not Mr. Wehelie was struggling for money? No. Α. But he did offer to pay Mr. Wehelie money at Ο. times? He did. Α. And on how many occasions did he offer to pay Mr. Wehelie money? I believe he paid him once in cash for the drugs Α. and then he provided him a phone. I'm sorry. What was the last part? 0. He provided him a telephone. So, there were two instances on which the agent paid Mr. Wehelie, apart from the gun incident; is that

```
No, that was the gun incident.
1
       Α.
 2
       Q.
            I'm sorry.
            The $300, the first payment, was for that.
 3
       Α.
            And then he -- the agent also paid Mr. Wehelie for
       Ο.
 4
    drugs and for a phone?
 5
            Drugs?
       Α.
 6
            I'm sorry. Did you --
 7
       Q.
            No.
 8
       Α.
            Let me back up. How many occasions did the agent
 9
       Q.
    pay Mr. Wehelie money?
10
            He paid him twice.
11
       Α.
            And one was for the guns and one was for a phone?
12
       Q.
            One was with a phone. It was -- there was no cash
13
       Α.
                    He provided him a phone instead of cash.
    with a phone.
14
            What was the first instance of payment about?
15
       0.
            It was about the guns.
16
       Α.
            How much money did he pay Mr. Wehelie?
17
       0.
            $300.
18
       Α.
            And when was that?
19
       Q.
            That was -- February 23rd.
20
       Α.
            And what was the other instance of payment, what
21
       0.
```

payment. That was when he was provided a cellular

That was -- I don't recall the exact date of that

date?

Α.

telephone.

22

23

24

- And was that February of 2016? 1 0. I don't believe so. 2 Α. January? 3 Q. I believe it was January. Α. 4 January of 2016 he paid Mr. Wehelie money? 5 0. He provided him a cellular telephone. Α. 6 He did not pay him any cash? 7 Q. No. 8 Α. What kind of phone did he provide him? 9 Q. Um, I believe it was a Samson Galaxy. 10 Α. Was it new? 11 Ο. It was. 12 Α. What's the approximate phone value of that phone? 13 Q. I believe it may be around \$600. 14 Α. On the first instance when the agent met Mr. 0. 15 Wehelie, was anybody else present? 16 Yes. Α. 17 Who else was present? 18 Ο. There were multiple others present. 19 Α. Could you identify them, please. 20 Q. MR. VAN GRACK: Your Honor, we would object 21
 - MR. VAN GRACK: Your Honor, we would object to the relevance of the other individuals involved in that meeting. There are other national security law enforcement sensitivities here and question its relevance in terms of conversation that was recorded and whether

23

24

the agent actually relayed the contents of those recordings.

MS. MERTZ: Your Honor, I have two responses. One is the government opened the door to this line of questioning by going into great delay on these alleged recorded phone calls and who said what. And, these are phone -- these are phone calls and meetings of multiple individuals present, and it is relevant to detention whether or not Mr. Wehelie was agreeing with what other people were saying or whether or not -- and other people were instigating the conversation.

THE COURT: How do you -- why do you need to know who those other people were to determine that answer to that question?

MS. MERTZ: Fair enough, Your Honor. I'll move on.

I BY MS. MERTZ:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- ${\tt Q}.$ So, there were multiple other people present?
- A. Yes.
 - Q. Were they all FBI agents?
- A. No.
 - o. Were some of them confidential informants?
 - A. They were not confidential informants of the FBI.
 - Q. And, where did that first meeting take place?
 - A. In Fairfax County, Virginia.

Where, specifically? 1 0. At a storage location. 2 Α. Whose storage location? 3 Q. I do not know. Α. 4 Was that meeting set up at the behest of the FBI? 5 0. It was. Α. 6 What was the purpose of that meeting? 7 Q. To introduce an undercover employee to Mr. 8 Α. Wehelie. 9 And yet this was the FBI's first meeting with him? 0. 10 Yes. 11 Α. So, you knew you were targeting Mr. Wehelie? 12 Q. Yes. 13 Α. Was that -- and was that first meeting recorded on Ο. 14 December 10th? 15 I do not -- I believe it was, but I know we have 16 the statement of the undercover employee. 17 And the other people present were civilians? 18 Ο. There were other law enforcement. 19 Α. In paragraph 7A of your affidavit, you make a 20 Q. reference to something called a notional scenario. Ts 21 that another term for hypothetical? 22 Yes. 23 Α. So, that paragraph describes a series of facts 24

that were posed by the FBI agent hypothetically?

A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- O. In a conversation with Mr. Wehelie?
- A. Correct.
 - Q. And none of those facts actually ever occurred?
- A. No, it did not.
 - Q. Did the FBI make any effort to determine whether or not Mr. Wehelie was telling the truth when he said he'd fired a weapon before?
 - A. We did not. There did not seem to be any way to actually verify whether on his time in a foreign country we could or could not tell if he fired a weapon.
 - Q. Did the FBI make any effort to ascertain whether or not Mr. Wehelie had ever possessed a weapon before?
 - A. Again, we could not verify that time. However, we did verify that he was in Yemen at the time when he stated.
 - Q. And he has family in Yemen, that's correct, or he had at the time?
 - A. At the time, yes.
 - Q. His brother, in fact?
 - A. Correct.
 - $\ \ \, \bigcirc$. And that December 22nd conversation, how is that recorded?
 - A. Digitally, with a digital recorder.
- Q. Is -- and you make reference to this term "whole

Can K be used as slang for other things on the 1 street? 2 I can't say exactly what K could or could not be 3 used for. 4 You've never heard it used as a term for special 5 K, a drug? 6 Α. I have heard that. 7 And have you ever heard it used as a term for 8 Ο. kilo, such as a quantity of drugs? I have. Α. 10 So, it could be a slang for something other than a 11 Ο. gun? 12 However, Mr. Wehelie used it in the terms of 1.3 attacking military location, he said, "get a whole K 14 fully loaded". 15 And, that again, is in the context of a 16 hypothetical scenario posed by the FBI agent? 17 No, that was in Mr. Wehelie's hypothetical of what 18 would happen if he could not travel. 19 And, in paragraph 7B, you refer to this 2.0 Q. conversation on January 21st. How is that phone 21 conversation recorded? 22 We have audio and video. 23 And, I'm sorry. Was that an in-person meeting or 24 Ο.

a telephone?

- A. The 21st was in person.
 - Q. Were other people present?
- A. Ah, yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

- Q. How many other people were present?
- A. One person joined them briefly.
- Q. I'm sorry.
 - A. One person joined them briefly.
- Q. Was that person law enforcement?
 - A. He was.
- Q. And, in that conversation, did Mr. Wehelie make any monetary offer to purchase a weapon?
 - A. I do not recall him making an offer to purchase one. He inquired how much one would cost.
 - Q. But he did not offer to pay a certain amount to buy one?
 - A. No.
 - Q. And, there's nothing in your affidavit about any follow-up conversation about him purchasing his own weapon?
 - A. Correct.
 - Q. And, there was no conversation future -- further conversation about him purchasing a weapon for himself, was there?
 - A. For himself, no.
 - Q. Returning to the conversation on February 18th,

```
how was that conversation recorded?
1
            In audio and visual, audio and video recordings.
 2
       Α.
            And how many people were present at that meeting?
 3
       Q.
            Which meeting?
       Α.
 4
            The meeting on February 18th?
 5
       Q.
            Which location?
       Α.
 6
            Sorry. I'll turn your attention to paragraph 8 A.
 7
       Q.
            Okay.
 8
       Α.
            And, that appears to be at a hotel in Baltimore,
 9
       Q.
    Maryland.
10
            Uh-huh.
       Α.
11
            How many people were present at that meeting in
12
    the hotel room?
13
            Two.
       Α.
14
            Besides Mr. Wehelie?
15
       Ο.
            No, one besides Mr. Wehelie.
16
       Α.
            Okay, and that's UCE 2?
17
       Ο.
            Correct.
18
       Α.
            And, who had proposed the idea that Mr. Wehelie
19
    transport four guns?
20
            UCE 1.
        Α.
21
            So, it was his idea?
22
        0.
            Yes.
23
       Α.
            And the guns involved in paragraph 8A had been
24
    rendered inoperable?
2.5
```

A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Had the FBI ever fired those guns to ascertain whether or not they were operable?
- $_{\mbox{\scriptsize A.}}$ I cannot say whether anybody at the FBI had. I had not.
 - Q. So, you don't know if they were ever operable?
 - A. I do not.
- Q. And, after the one FBI agent gave the four guns to Mr. Wehelie, he then drove them to a second FBI agent waiting in Springfield, Virginia; is that correct?
- A. He drove them to another undercover law enforcement officer.
- Q. Okay. So, the only transfer that Mr. Wehelie accomplished was from one FBI agent to another FBI agent?
- A. Yes.
- Q. And, after he delivered the guns, the FBI agent paid him money, correct?
 - A. On a separate meeting, yes.
- Q. On a separate meeting. But did not arrest him?
 - A. No.
 - Q. Did -- you do say in here that you followed -- surveilled Mr. Wehelie on his trip from Baltimore to Springfield, correct?
 - A. Yes.
- 25 Q. And, did you follow him or somebody follow him the

```
entire way?
1
            Yes.
 2
       Α.
            Did he stop at all?
       Q.
 3
            Um, no.
       Α.
 4
            Was anybody else involved in the transfer?
 5
    Besides Mr. Wehelie, was anybody else with him in the
 6
    car?
 7
            No.
 8
       Α.
            And he never trans -- he never switched cars or
       Q.
    anything like that?
10
            No.
11
       Α.
            Was anybody -- how many agents were waiting for
12
    him in Springfield?
13
            He met with one person.
       Α.
14
            And after that transfer on February 18th, five
15
       0.
    months ago, did the agent reach out to Mr. Wehelie again?
16
            The agent that he dropped him off to, no.
       Α.
17
            Did the undercover agent number one, as he's
18
    referred to in your affidavit, reach out to Mr. Wehelie
19
    again?
20
            Yes.
       Α.
21
            How many times would you say he reached out to Mr.
22
    Wehelie after that?
23
            Um, numerous.
24
       Α.
            For how long?
2.5
       Q.
```

```
For several months.
1
       Α.
           And, after that date, February 18th, Mr. Wehelie
 2
    did not make any further attempts to purchase firearm; is
 3
    that right?
 4
           Ah, correct.
 5
           And, there's no record that he's ever purchased a
 6
    firearm?
 7
       Α.
            No.
 8
            And other than that occasion and the instance in
       Q.
    paragraph 7A in Yemen, there's no evidence he's ever
10
    possessed any other firearm, is there?
11
            No.
       Α.
12
           And, your agent searched Mr. Wehelie's family's
13
    home last week; is that correct?
14
           Yes.
       Α.
15
           And did they find my firearms?
16
       Q.
            No.
       Α.
17
            And, in response to the undercover agent's attempt
18
    to reach out to Mr. Wehelie after February 18th, would it
19
    be fair to say that Mr. Wehelie stopped responding to
20
    him?
21
            Yes.
22
       Α.
                              Nothing further, Your Honor.
                 MS. MERTZ:
23
```

RENECIA A. SMITH-WILSON, RMR, CRR

MR. VAN GRACK: Your Honor, just a few.

Any redirect?

THE COURT:

24

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. VAN GRACK:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

- Q. Just now defense counsel asked whether after February 18th the undercover law enforcement officer, UCE 1 reached out to the defendant. Do you recall that question?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Did in fact, after February 18th, UCE 1 communicate with the defendant?
- A. Yes.
- $\ \ \, \bigcirc$. And, in those communications, did the defendant and the law enforcement officer have any discussions about ISIL?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. In that period of time -- is that the period of time in which the defendant discussed going to a military recruiting center and shooting individuals?
- A. Yes, it was. That's also the time when he was showing the videos to the undercover.
- Q. And, during that period of time until the day he was arrested, was the defendant under surveillance?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. And how would you describe that surveillance?
 - A. Constant and daily.
 - Q. And, could you tell the Court when was the

defendant arrested? 1 2 Α. July 7th. And can you tell the Court why the defendant was Ο. 3 arrested on July 7th? 4 The defendant was traveling. 5 Where was the defendant traveling to? Q. 6 To Minneapolis. 7 Α. And why did the defendant -- why did the FBI 8 0. decide to arrest the government -- arrest the defendant 9 as he was traveling to Minneapolis? 10 We did not know if this was the first part of any 11 other travel. We had know idea where his destination 12 was, ultimate destination was. 1.3 MR. VAN GRACK: No more questions, Your 14 Honor. 15 MS. MERTZ: Your Honor, if I may briefly. 16 THE COURT: They have the obligation, so they 17 get the last word. 18 MS. MERTZ: Thank you, Your Honor. 19 THE COURT: Agent Gaylord, if you know --20 THE WITNESS: Yes. 21 THE COURT: -- to the best of your 22 understanding, did Mr. Wehelie -- who did Mr. Wehelie 23 believe he was dealing with when he was dealing with the 24

three undercovers?

THE WITNESS: To the best of my knowledge, 1 based on the recordings and the conversation I overheard, 2 he believed he was dealing with somebody who may 3 potentially help him travel to Syria -- or to Libya and 4 join ISIS. 5 THE COURT: So you have no information in 6 your possession that would suggest that Mr. Wehelie would 7 believe he was dealing with FBI agents? 8 THE WITNESS: No, sir. THE COURT: You have no information in your 10 possession that would suggest that Mr. Wehelie believed 11 when he moved the four firearms or machine guns from 12 undercover two to undercover three, that he had any 1.3 information in his possession that would suggest that he 14 knew those weapons were inoperable? 15 THE WITNESS: No. 16 THE COURT: Thank you. Does the Court's 17 questions elicit any other questions from counsel? 18 MR. VAN GRACK: No more questions for the 19 government, Your Honor. 20 MS. MERTZ: Just one question, Your Honor. 21 BY MS. MERTZ: 22 Was the -- when Mr. Wehelie transferred the 23 weapons, was that understood to be in connection -- what 24 was the purpose of that purchase to his knowledge? 2.5

```
There was no purpose laid out to him. He was just
1
       Α.
    asked and he agreed.
2
           And it had nothing to do with alleged terrorism or
       Ο.
3
    anything like that?
 4
           No.
       Α.
5
           Thank you.
       Q.
 6
                 THE COURT: Mr. Gaylord, you may step down.
7
                 (Thereupon, the witness withdrew from the
8
    stand.)
9
                 THE COURT: Government have anything further?
10
                 MR. VAN GRACK:
                                 No, we do not, Your Honor.
11
                 THE COURT: Government have argument?
12
                                Yes, Your Honor. The primary
                 MR. VAN GRACK:
13
    basis for the government's seeking detention is the
14
    danger to the community.
15
                As the Court just heard from Special Agent
16
    Gaylord's testimony, the representations made by the
17
    defendant are of the most serious type of danger. It's
18
    an individual who spoke about not just supporting ISIS,
19
    not just encouraging others to support ISIS, but actually
20
    discussing a plan that he had thought through of
21
    traveling to join ISIS as well as a plan that if that
22
    travel failed, that he would, in fact, engage in
23
    terrorist activity in the United States. Again, not just
24
    a random shooting, but a plan to go to a specific
25
```

location, a military recruiting center and how he would dupe the individuals in that military recruiting center into thinking that this was someone who was actually seeking to be recruited.

In this -- the United States would argue this is the most serious type of danger. In light of what's occurred in Orlando, San Bernardino, these are the types of comments and actions that we must, as a community in the United States take seriously.

In those instances, there's often comments and questions about what signs were there, what indicators did we have as a community that this individual was going to engage in violence. And the United States submits that the testimony from Special Agent Gaylord indicates that these are the types of indicators and signs.

This is an individual who sought to obtain a firearm for himself. In fact, he sought to obtain it through another individual to conceal his potential possession. That's the cousin that Special Agent Gaylord referred to earlier. It's someone who has violated the law in the past; someone who for \$300 was willing to violate the law again.

In addition to, you have someone who made statements about supporting ISIL, showed videos, enjoyed,

2.5

was brought to tears and emotion when asked whether he was a supporter of ISIL, and again, relate specific plans that he had in mind in order to provide support for ISIL.

In addition to the dangerous aspect, the United States submits that we have a very serious offense, a ten-year felony in which the evidence is overwhelming as heard in the testimony and in the complaint, the evidence are recordings and individuals who specifically corroborate that the defendant took possession of the weapons, knew what the weapons were, and transported them across state lines.

We also have, as relayed in the Pretrial Services report, indication that he was, in fact, a felon and had a felony on his record. And the final point that the government would raise as relayed in the Pretrial Services report, you've an individual with a history of nonappearance for the felony that is identified as statutory burglary, that he was sentenced to three years imprisonment suspended, conditioned on good behavior, and probation.

And the defendant violated that probation as discussed. There were four instances in which the defendant failed to appear in front of the probation officer. There's also another instance reported in that -- in the report in which the individual, the

1.3

2.5

defendant failed to appear in court and I believe there was a bench warrant out for his arrest.

And then the final comment the government would make at this time is in the report there is a representation that his family would be willing to host him and watch over him as a condition of release. And the United States submits that all of the conduct that was just described, not just in the report, but the evidence described in court occurred while the defendant was with his family, either living with his family or near his family or when he was spending significant amount of time with his family. And so that gives the government no comfort. It should give the community no comfort that that, in fact, would allow the defendant to meet whatever conditions defense counsel would believe are sufficient.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MS. MERTZ: Thank you, Your Honor.

Notwithstanding the government's attempt to portray Mr. Wehelie with or paint him with all of the fervor and furor that's been going on in the country for the last few weeks, Mr. Wehelie is charged with being a felon in possession. He's not charged with any charges relating to terrorism.

Having now had a chance to --

THE COURT: Is it your position this Court is only supposed to consider in making a determination on the safety of the community, the current charges against him?

MS. MERTZ: Absolutely not, Your Honor. However, I would suggest that the weight of some of the government's evidence may be belied by the charge they are bringing in this case.

Mr. Wehelie, as the probation officer's report states, was not with his family for the last year. He is now of recently with his family again.

He -- Mr. Wehelie is a United States citizen. He graduated from Lake Braddock High School. Has he struggled in the last few years? Yes, he has. He's been smoking too much pot. And he has been -- had a really difficult time trying to get a job because of his prior felony, which he has a prior felony and that makes it very difficult in this country to get a job.

But he has been trying to turn his life around. He has achieved two years of college. He is somebody who loves his family. His -- two of his sisters and his parents are here today in support of him and they would welcome the opportunity to vouch for him.

He -- there are ample allegations by the government that he has made statements about violence,

but there is no evidence that he has a history of violence. He has no convictions for violence. He has not possessed a weapon to the government's knowledge.

The government searched his home, and they did not find any weapons. When he was traveling, what the government didn't mention is that he was going to stay with his aunt for a basketball tournament. He is a basketball player. He played for the high school team and he played for Hood College for a year.

He does acknowledge that he has struggled with substance abuse, and he would knowledge that he has struggled with unemployment and that those things have caused him some turmoil for the last year or two.

But he would seek substance abuse treatment and mental health treatment, and he would certainly submit to electronic monitoring and to the custodianship of his parents. But, he is not a risk of flight.

The government has seized his passport. And he is -- the government has not alleged that he has done anything other than have loose conversations at the instigation of the FBI.

So, we would submit that he should be released at this time and that there are conditions that can both secure his appearance before this Court.

I would point out that the prior failures to

2.5

appear are seven -- six years old when he was still a teenager, and he did complete the probation that the government has made -- has raised. He completed that successfully ultimately.

So, we would ask this Court to consider conditions which would permit him to be released to the custodianship of his family who are here today and are willing to change their work schedule so that one of -- his parents are willing to change their work schedules so that one of them can always be at home with him. And we would ask the Court that if the Court is considering doing that, that we would submit that he would -- he would readily agree to an attend substance abuse treatment and mental health counseling at the Court's -- the direction of the probation officer to assist him.

THE COURT: Now, Mr. Wehelie obviously is a risk of flight based on the four failures -- three failures to appear to court appearances in the past as well as the four failures to appear before his supervising probation officer.

However, the Court believes there may be a combination of conditions of release that could reasonable assure his appearance in future court proceedings; that being him being in the custody of his parents, GPS monitoring perhaps.

1.3

2.5

The Court's more concerned with the safety of the community. The Court will adopt as its own the assessments of nonappearance and danger as set forth on page five of the report.

Based on the nature of the instance offense, the Court understands that he's only, at this juncture, been charged with being a felon in possession of firearms. The types of the firearms that he was in possession which causes this Court significant concerns.

The agent in his testimony referenced these firearms as machine guns, capable of firing up to 1200 rounds a minute. He possessed four of them, provided them to someone he believed may have been trying to assist ISIS themselves. He didn't believe these individuals were FBI agents. He had no basis to believe that these weapons were inoperable. His acknowledge at the time is important or his lack of knowledge thereof is important as well.

The fact that he had no previous criminal history is a double-edged sword. In fact, an individual who has a history of crimes of violence this Court may understand why more they would want to join an organization such as ISIL that conducts themselves in such a way as to behead individuals and to burn individuals alive. An individual that has absolutely no

2.5

criminal history, the Court finds it extremely difficult why such an individual would want to join such an organization.

So, the nature of the instant offense, in and of itself, is strong. But the facts and the statements by Mr. Wehelie underline the instant offense, statements he made to three undercover officers while conducting or committing the instant offense in regards to wanting to join ISIL, wanting to travel to join ISIS, if he couldn't join ISIS, what he would actually do, commit attacks in the United States of America cause this Court significant concerns.

Obviously, it causes the Court even more concerns when he's making these statements while he's under the influence of a mood-altering drug. It also causes this Court, in combination with the fact that assessment of danger number three, unknown mental health status with an individual who has an unknown mental health status or possibly an unknown mental health status talking about committing jihad either over in Yemen or Libya or Iraq and Syria or in the United States causes this Court even more concern.

It says an unknown mental health status, but the people who know him best, his parents and his sister believes that he does have an underlying mental health

```
Without that having been taken care of and the
    issue.
1
    fact that he's around transporting weapons, this Court
2
    concludes there are no combination of conditions of
3
    release that would reasonably assure the safety of the
4
    community. Therefore Mr. Wehelie will be detained prior
5
    to further proceedings. He is remanded to the custody of
 6
    the United States Marshals.
7
                 MS. MERTZ:
                             Thank you, Your Honor.
8
                 (Proceedings concluded at 3:19 p.m.)
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIPTION

I, Renecia Wilson, hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript that was typed by me from the recording provided by the court. Any errors or omissions are due to the inability of the undersigned to hear or understand said recording. Further, that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the above-styled action, and that I am not financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of the above-styled action.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereto subscribed my name this 22nd day of July, 2016.

/s/ Renecia Wilson, RMR, CRF Official Court Reporter